

AUS920030326US1

10/606,683

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAR 08 2007

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In his Office Action the Examiner first rejected claims 10 -15 under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter, inviting Applicants' attention to <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/og/2005.week47/patgupa.htm>. Applicants have amended those claims by making them conform, in form, to those in commonly assigned USP 5,710,578 to Beauregard et al. (Beauregard). This patent was the first to recite what have become known as "Beauregard Claims" to computer program products as articles of manufacture. Applicants believe the 101 rejection is overcome.

The Examiner then applied a new reference in rejecting the three independent claims, 1, 4, and 10, under 35 USC 102. The Examiner asserts published application US 2003/0014274 A1 to Chalon (Chalon) anticipates Applicants' invention. The present invention, as claimed, enables a user to indicate language usage pattern preferences and thereafter have information presented using those preferences. Chalon does appear, broadly, to describe taking user input, analyzing it and using the results of the analysis to modify subsequent presentations to the user. However, it is only in passing in paragraph 0057 that Chalon even mentions that a user profile may contain preferred languages. Indeed, Applicants acknowledge that it is known in the prior art to allow user's to choose a language. See the Background of the Invention on page 1 of the Specification. Applicants describe and claim user language usage preferences. As noted in the Specification, page 2 Summary, language usage pattern preferences are independent of the language spoken / written by the user. Chalon nowhere addresses this aspect of user preferences. Therefore, Applicants traverse this 102 reference.

Using similar reasoning, Applicants assert that Chalon cannot render their independent claims obvious, alone or in any combination with the other cited references. None of the references cited and applied by the Examiner address a user's preferred language usage pattern.

As in their responses to prior rejections, Applicants maintain that none of references used by the Examiner in rejecting Applicants dependent claims under 35 USC 103 in view of

Response to December 8, 2006 Office Action March 8, 2007

Page 6 of 7

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUS920030326US1

MAR 08 2007

10/606,683

various Chalon based combinations with commonly assigned US 2002/0152244A1 to Dean et al. (Dean) claims 2, 5, and 13; commonly assigned US Patent 6,584,180 B2 to Nemoto (Nemoto) claims 3, 8, 9, 11 and 12; Dean and US 2004/0030557A1 to Culy et al. (Culy). The difference between these rejections and those stated in his July 5, 2006 Office Action is that the Examiner has replaced the former combination of Hayashi and Reynolds with Chalon. Applicants' prior reasons for traversing these rejections are still pertinent.

In summary, Applicants traverse the art based rejections primarily based on the lack of teaching or suggestion in Chalon, or in any combinations based on Chalon, of utilizing a user's preferred language usage pattern as described and claimed in the instant application in preparing subsequent presentation by the system to the user. Applicants have amended claims 10 - 15 to bring them closer in form to the computer program product claims in Beauregard.

Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw his rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,


Andrea Pair Bryant, Reg. No. 28,191

Attorney for Applicants

(512) 345-5806

Response to December 8, 2006 Office Action March 8, 2007

Page 7 of 7